



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

by the terms subject and predicate, noun and verb, which the remaining parts of speech understood to a greater or less degree, varying according to the individual. Now, side by side with his introduction in the English class to the object complement, the attribute complement, and the prepositional phrase, he meets in Latin the direct object, the predicate noun and adjective, and the use of prepositions, all emphasized in Latin by the importance of the cases. Later, the advance in knowledge of grammatical relations is made much more rapidly in the Latin class than in the English. At the very beginning, the pupil is met by the distinctions of person and number, which are so little to be seen in English. In short, the two classes reinforce each other; but, since the new principles are so much more frequent and so much more noticeable in Latin, the knowledge gained tends to be applied in the English class. Pupils tell me, in speaking of some new subject taken up in English grammar, 'O yes, we understood it. We had had it already in Latin'.

Besides the phase of English grammar, there is that of English spelling. Of late, I have been in the habit of running over the list of spelling words with my A8 Latin class, giving them the Latin from which the English is derived. They are much surprised to notice how large a proportion of these words is from Latin which they themselves know; also, how one can often guess at the meaning of an English word from the meaning of the original. They are interested in peculiar developments, a case in point being Latin *villa* and English *villain*. Another instance is seen in a remark made by one of this class after the spelling test was over, 'I knew how to spell *nautilical* because I knew *nauta*'. They make derivations of their own as well, e.g. 'If *bos* is Latin for 'cow', is English *bossy* from it?'

Viewing in the large the California experiment of introducing the study of Latin into the seventh and the eighth grades, there is little room for doubt that the new departure is proving a conspicuous success. At any rate there is now coming up in the public schools a generation of Latin students who love their work, to whom translation at sight is a satisfaction and a joy, and for whom the rendering of English into Latin is a simple, easy, everyday matter. Surely such results are significant.

Very interesting, too, is the reflex influence which this new work is exerting upon the methods pursued with the regular ninth grade beginners. In Berkeley, the teachers in the Lower High Schools, after experimenting in the seventh and the eighth grades, decided some time ago to abandon traditional methods with their ninth grade classes also, and have since used the same general outline of work for all grades. In other towns, too, which have only the four-year Latin course, teachers here and there are availing themselves of this new method of infusing life and human interest into the work of their ninth grade classes. So far as known, the success attending this innovation has been very gratifying.

In concluding, the writer desires to express his hearty thanks to the numerous teachers who have contributed so generously of their time, thus making it possible to construct an article which rests, not

on general impressions merely, but rather upon the direct testimony of those most intimately concerned with the work described.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

H. C. NUTTING.

REVIEWS

Stoic and Epicurean. By R. D. Hicks. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons (1910). Pp. xix + 412. \$1.50.

This volume appears in a series entitled Epochs of Philosophy, and most admirably accomplishes the purpose of a contribution to such a series. The aim of the series is "to present the significant features of philosophical thought in the chief periods of its development", and "to emphasize especially those doctrines which have appeared as effective factors in the evolution of philosophical thought as a whole". To have set forth each system in its historical evolution, following the successive periods within the Stoic and the Epicurean schools, would have been an easier work of exposition and analysis. But the writer of this volume was committed to a different mode of exposition; not that any active process of exclusion was so much involved, but, rather, an all-embracing knowledge of the details of the two systems had to undertake the far more difficult task of exploitation whereby the two systems would be set forth in just such a way as to elicit their significant and permanent features. Therefore we find the four initial chapters, which are devoted to Stoicism, concerned with such problems as I Pantheism, II Psychology and Epistemology, III Moral Idealism, IV The Teaching of the Later Stoics. Similarly, the three following chapters on Epicureanism discuss the subject by means of such problems of the school as V Hedonism, VI The Atomic Theory, VII Epicurean Theology. While the account of the agnostic arguments which Carneades used against Stoicism is especially good, yet the three remaining chapters of the book, VIII Scepticism in the Academy: Carneades, IX Eclecticism, X Aenesidemus and the Revival of Pyrrhonism, seem detached and do not constitute as integral a portion of the body of the work as might have been the case if the views of the adversaries and critics of the Stoics had been incorporated in the previous chapters and merged into earlier discussions; Posidonius, the real maker of later Stoicism, instead of appearing in chapter four, as might have been expected, is relegated to these later chapters and loses in importance by such an arrangement.

A useful chronological table of names and dates from the time of Epicurus's birth to the days of Diogenes Laërtius precedes the first chapter, while the last is followed by a select bibliography; a full index brings the volume to a close. There are some curious omissions from the bibliography, such as the later reprint of Usener's *Epicurea*, the more recent,

augmented edition of Guyau, *La Morale d'Epicure*, Reichel's translation of Zeller's *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics*, and Windelband's *Geschichte der Antiken Philosophie*. One misses also the names of Boissier, Bann, Capes, Davidson, Décharme, Gomperz, Pascal, Picavet, and Wallace; though some of these works are cited in the body of the book, e.g. in foot-notes, yet even a select bibliography should have included them, without growing to the undue proportions of the bibliography in E. Vernon Arnold's book, *Roman Stoicism* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 5.213-214). The bibliography should certainly also have made mention of the work of Unger and of Brinker; their names appear without further explanation in the chronological table. In the list of editions that brings the bibliography to a close no edition is mentioned of either Diogenes Laërtius or of Philodemus. Typographical errors are very rare.

As Professor Hicks says in his Preface, "the philosophical systems of Zeno and Epicurus may profitably be studied together", as possessing a fundamental similarity and exalting practice above theory; by conceding to sense and experience their full right, these two schools were differentiated from the extreme intellectualism of an earlier age. Professor Hicks's method of freely citing sources in translation is to be commended; the reader is thus vividly reminded of the grounds upon which the author's interpretations rest. Such translations include large quotations from both Greek and Roman sources from early to late periods of the two schools.

In the skillful discussion of the origin and nature of Stoic Pantheism, there is perhaps little that is quite new but the whole treatment is illuminating and of special value in bringing out clearly the eternal nature of Stoic problems. The points of contrast between Stoic religious aspiration and Christianity are numerous, and it is a recognition of these affinities that also in large part contributes to the inspiring character of James Adam's essay on *The Hymn of Cleanthes in his Vitality of Platonism*. Professor Hicks's exposition has also a value of another sort; his insistence upon explaining Stoic Pantheism through Greek experience and earlier Greek philosophy may serve as a check upon that fascinating but false speculation that admits Persian influence and remote currents of thought and feeling before establishing all the facts of native intellectual development. It is a real pleasure to follow the logic of the third chapter, which is devoted to an investigation of Moral Idealism, especially because of the author's independent reasoning which leads to somewhat new conclusions. These touch, especially, upon definitions of Stoic classifications of objects and of actions, and the validity of Zeller's time-honored formulae is challenged. Though the

end of all action may be resignation to the Universe or to the inner law of causality, yet Stoic virtue does not thereby result in passive submission, because of the constant growth of the virtuous man and his progress toward Wisdom, Reason, and Harmony with the Law of Nature to which he will and can, only ultimately, consciously surrender. But that ultimate never arrives, in fact. Therefore we are not to attach to the early Stoics the rigid formula that regards all externals as 'indifferents', placed between virtue and vice. Genius, health, wealth, beauty, life are, to be sure, neither morally good nor evil *per se*, but gain their true value through judgment, which may convert them into material for the exercise of virtue. Consequently a new classification of goods, as well as of actions and of emotions, must be predicated of the early Stoics, if this refined treatment be correct. A priori it seems reasonable enough because of the early opposition of Stoics to Cynics and we may thus be deprived of our former conception of the Stoic Wise man as a passionless sage or a block of marble. Chapter six gives us one of the best statements in English of the Epicurean Atomic Theory. In dealing with Epicurean theology in the seventh chapter Professor Hicks feels himself upon less certain ground and awaits the exploration of *Herculeum* for further light upon this "puzzling riddle". I find this the least satisfactory chapter in the book, not altogether abreast of the latest criticism, which would hardly admit the truth of "clearly, then, no prayers, no vows, no presage of the future ought to find a place in religion as conceived by Epicurus". The personality of the gods, also, was more clearly conceived than this chapter allows; but the establishment of such an hypothesis was outside the domain of this chapter, which carefully reviews the conjectures of Lachelier, Scott and Giussani; the chapter rests upon a conservative study of the sources, presents no heresies and is excellent reading all the way.

In fact, this is true of the entire work, which ought to carry inspiration to many. The lucidity, the sanity and the eloquence of the writer should appeal to others beside professional scholars. Students of ancient philosophy may well be pleased with a work that emphasizes over and over again the modernity of these ancient modes of thought. This manner of treatment is especially desirable at a time that needs to have the impression deepened of the fundamental unity of world thought, ancient and present. Professor Hicks's sympathetic treatment of Stoicism leads him into genuine enthusiasm for the teaching of Epictetus, Musonius and Marcus Aurelius. The elaborate exegesis on duties escapes monotony; on the contrary, it is filled with timely admiration for later Stoic ideals regarding womanhood, humanity and justice, and for the exalted

nature of Stoic virtues of purity, chastity and philanthropy. Earlier abstract theories had, as is well-known, been modified by the exigencies of life. While we may not follow Professor Hicks in predicating "cheery optimism" of the earlier Stoics, yet the ethics of the later school were of a sort that have immortal value. In conclusion, the synthetic nature of this work and the constant endeavor to estimate, and to interpret will secure for it an honored place in the literature of the subject.

GEORGE DEPUE HADZSITS.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

Thucydides, Book VI. Edited, on the basis of the Classen-Steup edition, by Charles Forster Smith. Boston: Ginn and Company (1913). Pp. xiii + 250. \$1.50.

The book comprises an Introduction, pages V-XIII; text and exegetical commentary, 1-205; a critical appendix, 206-243; indices, 245-250; and reproductions of Kiepert's maps, of Sicily (colored), of the Siege of Syracuse, and of the Retreat of the Athenians.

The Classen-Steup edition of the sixth book of Thucydides appeared so long ago (1905) that any review of its merits or defects at the present time would be futile. An acquaintance with this edition on the part of all interested in Thucydides is to be assumed, and the reviewer of this volume of the College Series of Greek Authors must confine himself to two practical questions: (1) how does the adaptation compare with the original; (2) how does it compare with its possible competitors for use as a class text-book.

My answer to the first of these questions is based upon a collation of Smith with Classen-Steup for twelve chapters chosen at random from the commentary and for the whole of the Appendix. In view of the lapse of eight years and Professor Smith's standing and reputation we might fairly have expected that his book would constitute a noticeable advance beyond its German basis in the exegesis of Thucydides. Expectation of this sort, however, is not fulfilled. There is very little material in the adaptation which is not already contained in the original edition. Of the new matter the smallest part is Professor Smith's own contribution—consisting chiefly of occasional references to Krüger, Kühner-Gerth, Hadley-Allen, Goodwin's Moods and Tenses, Gildersleeve's Syntax of Classical Greek, Smyth's Melic Poets, and Professor Smith's articles in volumes 25 and 31 of the Transactions of the American Philological Association (Some Poetical Constructions in Thucydides, and Traces of Epic Usage in Thucydides); the bulk is composed of notes that recall the Notae Variorum editions. As an example of these I choose the note on 41.11: 'ἐς τὴν κατασκοπὴν: with a view to finding out, i.e. 'their readiness for war' (Cl.), or 'their state of mind in

the present condition of things' (St.), or 'about the coming and the designs of the enemy' (Valla, etc.)." Another example is afforded by App. 62.20: 'περίεπλευσαν: Cl. wrote *περίεπεμπον*. . . on the ground that . . . On the same ground St. changes to *περίεπεμψαν* . . . and this also Steup¹, Mueller and Hude adopt.

Bm. Kr. Bl. Marchant, Spratt, and the Oxford text keep *περίεπλευσαν*.—Cl. calls attention. . . Thirlwall seems to understand. . . Grote says . . . Holme lets Nicias go. . . Cl. thought. . . The sources of such notes are the editions named in the Preface; where, by the way, occurs a sentence that deserves attention: "Marchant's and Spratt's commentaries, which have been at hand in the last stages of the work, would have proved more helpful had they been always consulted from the outset". How is this sentence to be understood? Marchant's edition appeared in 1897, Spratt's in 1905, and Professor Smith could not have begun his work before the latter date.

The student of Thucydides who has access to the Classen-Steup edition can gain from the consultation of this adaptation only in one way. In a number of passages Professor Smith adopts a reading different from the text of the German edition. In these the student may learn that Steup's argument did not convince Professor Smith. Compare, for instance, App. 17.1: "Steup substitutes *κἀνταῦθα* for *καὶ ταῦτα* and in a critical note expresses himself substantially as follows . . .". Or, again, he may learn whose explanation has commended itself to Professor Smith. Compare App. 23.2: "Jowett's explanation is satisfactory". Then comes a quotation of eleven lines, followed by a condensation of Classen-Steup's note. In neither case is there an exposition of the merits or defects of the arguments.

Besides the additions such as indicated, the adaptation consists in a rejection of part of the material, in condensing some of the rest, in transposing more—especially from commentary to Appendix—and to some extent of filling in notes for which Classen-Steup offered only a cross-reference to another book of Thucydides. Various misprints and false references have been corrected; and references to Thucydides have been changed systematically from book, chapter, section, to book, chapter and line.

That these changes serve, on the whole, to facilitate the use of the book by college students may be freely recognized. At the same time, however, it must be pointed out that the condensation is secured in some cases only at the cost of clearness, while in other passages the meaning of the German has been missed in a way which was not to be expected. Thus 'begin to lust after' (p. 209) is not a proper rendering of "Lust bekommen"; "matter of his action" (p. 215) instead of "manner of his action" may be merely a misprint, but it is the point on which the

¹ One of Steup's reasons is thus ignored.